DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 056 FL 800 386

AUTHOR Enriquez, Blanca E.; And Others
TITLE Family Literacy for Parents of Pre-Schoolers: A Title VII First-Year Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Education Service Center Region 19, El Paso, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Oct 90
NOTE 42p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; *Family Programs; *Literacy Education; Needs Assessment; *Parents; Preschool Children; Program Design; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Research Methodology
IDENTIFIERS *Family Literacy; Texas (El Paso)

ABSTRACT

The first-year report of the El Paso (Texas) Family Literacy for Parents of Preschoolers program describes the program and evaluates its progress toward stated objectives. The introductory section addresses the following topics: demographic and literacy characteristics of the community; the needs assessment; project design; and objectives for parent outcomes, instructional techniques, materials development, staff development, and parent involvement. The second section describes in greater detail the methods of data collection, data processing, choice of appropriate comparison group, and research limitations. Section three chronicles program implementation during the first year, including instructional services, material use and development, qualifications of all staff members, and parent involvement. The fourth section outlines seven specific objectives for parent outcomes and the findings for each. The outcomes concern parent recruitment, materials development, instructor training, assessment, instructional sessions, research, and dissemination. The final section provides conclusions and recommendations for each of the seven objectives. A participant self-evaluation form is appended. (MSE) (Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse on Literacy Education)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED337056

FAMILY LITERACY FOR PARENTS OF PRE-SCHOOLERS
A TITLE VII FIRST-YEAR EVALUATION REPORT

1989-1990

T003J90051-90

SUBMITTED TO:

U.S. Department of Education
OBEMLA
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202-4725

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Enriquez and others

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SUBMITTED BY:

Region XIX Education Service Center
6611 Boeing Drive
El Paso, Texas 79925

October 1990

FL800386

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Technical Report Prepared By:

Blanca E. Enriquez
Director of Family Literacy Project

Margarita Calderón, Ph.D.
Family Literacy Project Researcher

Maria Luisa Gonzalez, Ph.D.
Keith McNeil, Ph.D.
Evaluators

Mary M. Lara
Documentation Specialist

FAMILY LITERACY FOR PARENTS OF PRE-SCHOOLERS
FIRST-YEAR EVALUATION REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

The El Paso Family Literacy for Parents of Pre-Schoolers Project completed its first operational year in July, 1990.

As stated in the original application, Illiteracy among Americans is clearly a paramount issue in the United States. Current research documents the scope and devastating impact of this nation-wide problem. Such efforts as the Youth 2000 Campaign have begun to project the cost to our citizenry as a result of high illiteracy rates. When translated into terms of limited income contributions, diminished productivity, and decreased participation, illiteracy becomes a stagnating element that affects society as a whole. As educators, we encounter the reality of the problem directly. Our classrooms are filled with students who cannot read, take and/or pass exams, or participate meaningfully in the mainstream of instructional programs. To further compound the dim outlook for these students, their parents are unable to assist them because they, too, lack academic skills. They, themselves struggle with textbooks, exams, and life's challenges. As a result, parents witness the next generation: the limited ability of their own children to break the cycle. These parents and their children are not only limited in their ability to negotiate the system, they cannot communicate effectively in the system's language. Such is the population in El Paso, Texas.

A. Background, Needs, and Competencies

The city of El Paso is located on the Mexican border with Ciudad Juarez as its neighboring community. El Paso's population is over half a million and together with Ciudad Juarez' populace of one and a half million, creates a booming metropolis with problems separated only by a political border. The following statements describe El Paso's population:

- The Hispanic population accounts for 62% of the population in El Paso and this is expected to increase to 68% by the year 2000. White/non-Hispanics account for 34% and Blacks 4% of the population.

- The percentage of the population under age 25 represents 48% of the total.

- El Paso's median household income is $14,002 compared to the national level of $20,000.

- In comparison to other cities of over 100,000, El Paso is ranked as one of the lowest in per capita income. In 1985, the per capita income was $8,755 while the United States average was $16,706, i.e., 45% below the national average.

- El Paso has 20,710 families living below the federal poverty guidelines, which amounts to 22.2% of the local population. (The national figure is only 15.2%.) Of these families, 83.3% are Hispanic.

- The city has a very high number of major welfare recipients. In 1987, El Paso had 145,132, or 25%, of the population receiving some public assistance as compared to the State's 2,993,589, or 18%.

- There are 35,000 people, or about 9,000 families, who live in public housing throughout El Paso.

- In 1987, the unemployment rate in El Paso was 10.9%; Texas was 8.6% and the U.S. had 6.3% for the year. The unemployment rate in El Paso has hovered around 10% for the past eight years.

- El Paso's school districts have some of the highest drop-out rates in the State. In 1980, 29% of the population over 25 years old had less than a

9th grade education. An additional 11.1% had completed from 1 to 3 years of high school. In sum, 40.1% of those over 25 years old has less than a 12th grade education.

- Illiterate adults account for an estimated 30% of the El Paso population. This is 10% greater then the estimated number of adults in the United States who are illiterate.

- In 1988, the school drop out rate and illiteracy were ranked by community leaders as numbers one and nine respectively in a list of the 10 most serious problems in El Paso.

- The city has experienced a population increase of over 10,000 people between 1986 and 1987. The Demographic Supervisor for the El Paso Department of Planning, Research and Development attributed much of this growth to a "natural increase," plus a net gain from immigration. However, a second reason is the proximity of the U.S.-Mexico border and the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 which has contributed to the increase in Mexican immigrants here, as well as the businesses that move here to support the Mexican maquiladora industry.

It is these characteristics that undoubtedly justify El Paso County as a recipient of Head Start Funds. In 1987, the Department of Health and Human Services granted Region XIX ESC the administration of the El Paso County Head Start Program. The county-wide Head Start program this past year provided services to 1,614 three- and four-year old children among 14 child development centers. Educational and support services are extended to low income children and their families.

B. Needs Assessment

In October 1988, 1,766 participating Head Start parents were asked to complete a Target Area Questionnaire. This questionnaire, coupled with Head Start children's detailed registration applications, rendered the following descriptive information on the families served by the program:

Ethnicity:

91% Hispanic
4% White
3% Black
1% Other

Employment:

62% Full-time employment
9% Part-time employment
5% Seasonally employed
24% Unemployed

Income:

20% earn less than $3,000
17% earn less than $6,000
23% earn less than $ 9,000
24% earn less than $12,000
9% earn less than $15,000
7% over $15,000

Home Language Dominance:

58% Spanish
42% English

Public Assistance:

20% Welfare
37% Other (including food stamps, housing, social security income)

Family:

31% Single-parent households
69% Two-parent households

Education*:

5% Single-parent households
29% Two-parent households
9% 1-3 years college
1% College
41% High school dropouts
15% G.E.D. certificate

* **Less than 2% of the parents surveyed are currently attending school or some kind of training program.**

In addition to the above statistics, children in Head Start have a history of poor health. This is evidenced by the vast number of referrals for initial and follow-up treatment after their physical examinations. In the area of dental care, 50% of the children require significant restorative treatment.

Additionally, last year the Head Start program had hepatitis outbreaks at four of its fourteen centers. Costs for medical treatments are overwhelming and keep children from attending pre-school centers. Parents are uninformed in the area of primary health habits that could prevent the need for treatment and improve their family's health. Available Head Start funds are limited and channeled to <u>direct</u> student services in the form of instructional/support personnel and fringe benefits, transportation costs, comprehensive medical and dental expenses for pre-schoolers and the cost of operating 14 child development centers. This leaves no funds to address the needs of the Head Start parents adequately. At present, funds are relegated to remediating chronic problems rather than intervention or prevention.

In view of these identified needs, parents would undoubtedly benefit from family literacy centers offering classes in ESL and literacy development; as well as parenting classes aimed at improving the quality and context of parent-child interaction and family health care.

The statistics described in this section are based on data documented by the following agencies: United Way of El Paso County, Bureau of Business and Economic Research at University of Texas at El Paso, Department of Planning, Research and Development with City of El Paso, Upper Rio Grande Private Industry Council, El Paso Independent School District, U.S. Bureau of the Census, and the El Paso Herald Post. The statistics of Head Start families were obtained from a survey conducted by the El Paso County Head Start Program using the Target Area Questionnaire. This questionnaire was developed by the El Paso County Head Start Program as part of a comprehensive needs assessment of participating Head Start families. The information reported on the health status of children is based on records of actual health services and costs. In summary, the methods used to identify the need for this project are both objective and quantifiable.

As a direct result of the identified needs, the Family Literacy for Parents of Pre-schoolers Project was implemented to ensure the success of LEP parents and their children in the early critical years of schooling. Parents of pre-schoolers were required to have a child enrolled in the Head Start program to be able to participate in the project.

C. Project Design

The project was designed to establish centers that could address the literacy needs of parents whose children were soon to enter the

neighborhood schools. The involvement of parents and their children at the pre-school serves to engage both in literacy activities, to provide both with relevant background knowledge and skills in preparation for school success.

The population targeted for this project was Head Start parents and their children. The 1,614 families served by the El Paso County Head Start Program were distributed among 14 pre-school centers. Of these, 6 were located in rural communities and 8 were located in urban communities. These 14 centers feed pre-school children into 8 independent school systems. The Family Literacy project impacted 7 of these Head Start centers. These were clustered around 4 Family Literacy Centers. The following factors were taken into consideration in the selection of the four Family Literacy Centers:

1. equal distribution of services to urban and rural communities;
2. greatest impact to centers with highest concentration of LEP populations;
3. equitable distribution of centers to impact various school districts receiving the Head Start children; and
4. availability of classrooms and facilities to conduct the adult classes.

Given these factors, the sites selected for housing the Family Literacy Centers were Fabens, Socorro, Tigua, and Parkdale. The two rural settings were Fabens and Socorro. The Fabens center, being reasonably centralized, offered participation to Clint and San Elizario, which are two neighboring rural centers. Socorro was selected as the other rural site because of its great need in terms of numbers of children and parent volunteers. It is currently the fastest growing rural center.

Tigua and Parkdale were selected as the two urban centers. Tigua was the largest urban site of all 14 Head Start centers. The Parkdale center was also selected because it was able to draw upon parents from Parkdale and Barcelona Head Start centers because of their close proximity. Two centers (one urban and one rural) implemented traditional ESL methods and the other two (one urban and one rural) used cooperative learning methods, which provided the basis for the research activities.

The seven Head Start centers selected for participation in this project are located in the following school districts: Fabens ISD, Clint ISD, San Elizario ISD, Socorro ISD, Ysleta ISD, and El Paso ISD. Each of these school districts are presently implementing Bilingual Education Programs for their LEP students. Initially each of these school districts participated in Title VII Bilingual Consortiums in order to institutionalize their current Bilingual Education Programs.

For the first project year, 118 parents of Head Start children participated in the project. These parents were transitioning their children to one of the six school districts mentioned above. Their participation in this family literacy project should enhance their continued participation in their children's education career.

1. Parent Outcomes

The **goals** of the project are:

1. To improve the English language and literacy skills of 100 parents of pre-school children in rural and urban settings.

2. To improve parent-child interaction through training in parenting skills, social skills, pre-literacy skills, self-concept and norms of schooling.

3. To conduct research and identify the effective elements that contribute to:

   a. Significant gains in second language acquisition by comparing Cooperative Learning methods to traditional instructional methods.

   b. Significant gains in literacy practice and literacy attitudes, and aspirations of parents towards their children's education.

In order to complete these goals, the following objectives will be accomplished over the three-year project period.

Objective 1 – Recruit

By December 1989, September 1990, and September 1991, identify a cadre of 20-25 parents at each of the four Head Start Centers to be participants in the three-year project.

Objective 2 – Materials Development

By December, 1989, design curricula and materials for the Family Literacy instructional components and by August 1990 and August 1991, improve upon curricula and materials.

Objective 3 – Training and Coaching

By December, 1989, train instructors on Cooperative Learning, Sheltered Instruction, Whole Language Approaches, and Parenting Skills, and continue coaching and retraining of the instructors throughout the duration of the project.

Objective 4 – Assessment

By May 1990, 1991 and 1992, conduct yearly pre- post-tests and 16-week session assessments to determine the impact on the parents' skills development.

Objective 5 – Parent Instruction

From January 1990 to May 1992, implement the instructional sessions for 100 parents at the four centers.

Objective 6 – Research

From January 1990 to May 1992, conduct a research project to study the effects of the different instructional strategies and of the training model.

Objective 7 – Dissemination

Publish and disseminate results of the study, the training model, the teaching model and the curricula.

2. Instructional Techniques

The three-year research design will study the effects of two different instructional strategies. Two centers are to implement Traditional ESL methods and the other two centers are to implement Cooperative Learning methods. Fabens Head Start and Parkdale Head Start (one rural and one urban) were selected as the sites that utilized Traditional Second-language Acquisition methods for their instruction and literacy activities. Socorro Head Start and Tigua Head Start (one rural and one urban) were selected to utilize extensive Cooperative Learning Methods for all their instruction and activities.

Data collected over the three-year project period will be used in order to answer more precisely the following research questions:

1. What are the essential components of effective instruction for parents of LEP students?

2. What impact does Cooperative Learning have on the participants?

3. What differences, if any, were found in the area of literacy and schooling attitudes between parents in classes utilizing distinct methodologies: Cooperative Learning vs. Traditional Approaches?

4. Does Cooperative Learning have a positive and significant impact on parents' self-concept and social skills?

5. What do instructors do with Cooperative Learning methods?

3. Materials Development

The basic curriculum for both the Traditional and cooperative ESL classes was to be developed during the first months of the project. Although existing strategies and materials could be used, they had to be integrated into a coherent curriculum. Project staff was not aware of any other effort in using Cooperative Learning strategies with parents of Head Start children.

4. Staff Development

Major staff development efforts were planned for the Traditional and Cooperative Learning methodologies in December. Staff were also trained on the administration of the LAS, the test used to determine participant's proficiency in English and Spanish.

Teachers were to be provided weekly training sessions specific to their expressed or observed needs.

5. Parent Involvement

The major focus of the Family Literacy Project is parent involvement. Parents were to attend a two and a half hour parenting skills class on a weekly basis. Parents were to be given assignments that would enable them to apply their newly acquired skills in their home environment with their children.

D. Summary of Findings from Previous Years

There are no previous year findings; this is the first year of the Family Literacy Project.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Data Collection Methods

Descriptive information reported was to include ethnicity, home language dominance, income level, educational level, employment status, public assistance, and number of parents in the family. Also reported was to be the number of parents from each site, the number of dropouts (along with the reason for dropping out), and how many were identified for ESL instruction.

Program implementation was to be measured by the Levels of Use checklist completed by the Project Director, Program Trainer, Parenting Skills Instructor, and ESL/Literacy Instructors at the end of each month.

The proposal indicated collection on a pre- and post-test basis the following information on LAS and Self-Esteem.

B. Description of Tests

The Levels of Use Checklist is a modification of the procedure used by Hall & Loecks.

The LAS has been used widely with monolingual and bilingual students, but is applicable to parents as well (attached as Appendix A).

The measure of self-esteem (attached as Appendix B), is a Spanish translation of the Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory.

C. Data Processing

The data was provided by the project staff to the evaluators. All analyses used the SAS statistical package.

D. Choice of Appropriate Non-project Comparison Group

The design of this project actually has two comparison groups--one project and one non-project. In the assessment of the efficacy of the Cooperative Learning methods, parents who receive that method will be compared to parents who received the same content, but with the traditional method. Gains will be compared.

In the assessment of the Family Literacy Project overall, gains of parents in the project will be compared to gains of parents not in the project.

E. Limitations of the Evaluation Plan

The evaluation is only limited by the relatively few number of teachers, sites, and parents receiving the various instructional models.

III. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

A. Instructional Services

Recruitment efforts began in October, 1989. The recruitment effort was initiated by the Head Start social workers who provided project staff with a list of parents who were in need of ESL and/or Parenting Skills classes. This list was compiled using the The Target Area Questionnaire and the Family Needs Assessment form. These forms are completed by parents during the enrollment process or after the child has been enrolled in Head Start. The Head Start teachers also identified those parents who were regular classroom volunteers and provided project staff with a list of these parents. Additionally, project staff attended parent orientation meetings for recruitment purposes and attended meetings with Head Start Site Managers, Social Workers, and Teachers, keeping them informed of the need for their assistance in recruitment efforts.

Recruitment efforts were successful but it was determined that for the second project year, a larger number of parents should be identified in order to keep a waiting list of interested parents so vacancies can be immediately filled as parents withdraw from the project. Recruitment efforts will also be directed to those parents who send their children to school on the bus. Project staff will be recruiting during bus routes to reach those parents who drop their children off at designated bus stops. An enrollment application is currently being developed for implementation in the second project year to facilitate the enrollment process and recruitment efforts.

ESL and Parenting classes were established and implemented the week of January 8, 1990 at the four Family Literacy Centers. These centers encompassed the areas of Clint, Fabens, San Elizario, Socorro, Ysleta, and

Central El Paso. The classes were structured and implemented as a family literacy program for parents of three- and four-year old Head Start children. The ESL instructional topics coincided with the parenting skills lessons, providing the necessary reinforcement for enhancing the learning process. Parents attended a two and a half hour ESL class and/or a two and a half hour parenting skills class on a weekly basis. As a follow-up to each ESL and parenting skills class, the parents were given assignments that would enable them to apply their newly learned skills in their home with their children. Both the ESL and Parenting Skills classes included family literacy activities, giving parents the opportunity to provide English literacy instruction to their children at home on a weekly basis. The assignments that parents were given entailed interaction with their children as they practiced developing social interaction skills. Parents were given the opportunity to develop basic English skills and acquire knowledge of the cultural norms and processes to assist their children at school.

ESL and Parenting Skills instruction were provided using both Cooperative and Traditional teaching methods. These classes were composed of 16 sessions and were scheduled in the morning and afternoon to accommodate parents. Two ESL and Parenting Skills classes were given at each of the four Head Start Family Literacy Centers per week. One ESL and Parenting Skills class per week was provided for those parents who could only attend morning classes and one ESL and Parenting Skills class was provided to those parents who could only attend afternoon classes. What makes this project unique is that parents have the opportunity to attend ESL and Parenting Skills classes while their children attend pre-school classes at the Head Start Centers. The parents who participated in the first project year expressed their appreciation for the time frame provided by the project.

Through the course of the first project year, project staff were sensitive to the needs, concerns, and special situations of the participating parents in an effort to assure maximum representation and ongoing participation. As needs arose, parents were guided to agencies that would assist them with their special needs. During the first project year, parents did not provide instruction to their children at the pre-school center. It was determined this would be important to implement in the second project year so parents may be observed to ensure anchoring of knowledge through immediate application; to ensure transfer of training; and to ensure the building of a strong bond of schooling between parent and child.

The project trainer and instructors worked closely with the Head Start Director and other Head Start personnel to ensure that developed materials were appropriate and culturally relevant. Both the ESL and Parenting Skills Curriculum are currently undergoing revisions to improve upon the materials for use in the second project year. The curricula will also include the areas of interest indicated in the questionnaire administered to project parents during the first project year.

B. Material Use and Development

The basic curricula and materials for both Traditional and Cooperative ESL classes were developed in November, 1989. Throughout the project year, ESL instructors revised and improved on the curriculum to meet the needs of the classroom participants. Cooperative Lesson Planning and ESL Lesson Planning forms were developed to assist the instructors in improving upon the curriculum.

The Parenting Skills curriculum was completed in October, 1989, and was developed around the Health Series books from Thomason General Hospital. This curriculum was also revised by the Parenting Skills Instructor through the course of the first project year in order to meet the needs of project participants. A questionnaire was administered to parents to determine areas of interest to be included in the curriculum for the second project year.

C. Staff Background, Expertise and Development Activities

The project necessitated two types of key personnel in order to achieve the stated goals and objectives. The administrative personnel included the director, trainer/researcher and the secretary. The instructional personnel included the parenting skills instructor and two ESL instructors. Described below is the project staff backgrounds, expertise and development activities.

Project Director

The project director had 20 years of teaching experience in Elementary Education and ESL. She held a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Elementary Education and was working towards her Master's Degree. She was certified in ESL; had previously taught adult ESL classes; had experience as consultant/supervisor for Adult Basic Education ESL classes, and had conducted teacher training for Adult ESL Classes. She had experience in the development of ESL Curriculum guides for 1st-6th Grade LEP students.

One hundred percent of the director's time was committed to the project. The director was responsible for program and personnel management, implementation, and evaluation. Other duties included financial management of project funds; coordination and monitoring of

training and instructional objectives; coordination with Head Start for the recruitment of parents; and the arrangement of facilities, procurement of instructional materials, development of curriculum, coordination with other entities, and development of reports to OBEMLA.

Project Trainer/Researcher

The project trainer/researcher had a Bachelor of Arts Degree in English, a Master's Degree in applied Linguistics, and a Ph.D. in Education. She had previously conducted research on Linguistic Minority Student, Teacher, and Parent Training; conducted extensive international staff development through her Multilingual Trainer of Trainers Institutes for Teachers, Parents, and Administrators. She had many publications, reports and teacher manuals on effective staff development and coaching programs for personnel working with Language Minority Students and on effective teaching methodologies for LEP Students. She was also half-time researcher/trainer at the Ysleta Independent School District. Her research project included developing Cooperative Elementary Schools which are also the schools where many of this projects' children will be entering.

Fifty percent of the project trainer/researcher's time was devoted to this project. The trainer/researcher was responsible for structuring the curriculum for parenting and ESL/Literacy instruction as well as training and coaching the instructional personnel. This was the focus of activities during the three-month pre-service phase of the project. As researcher, this person structured the research and evaluation format of the project and monitored and evaluated the delivery of instruction. Data gathering, revision of curriculum and training packets as well as writing of the project implementation model were the focus during the actual delivery of instruction.

Parenting Skills Instructor

The parenting skills instructor had a Bachelor's Degree in Psychology and was working towards her Master's Degree in Counseling. She had one year experience in Social Work; four years experience working with parents and children; four years experience in direct instruction or group facilitating of adults; and two years supervisory experience.

One hundred percent of the parenting skills instructor's time was dedicated to the project. The parenting skills instructor was directly responsible for developing weekly lesson plans and teaching activities for parenting skills instruction; for teaching the parenting skills classes, and for keeping attendance and achievement records of the participating parents. The parenting skills instructor assisted in the recruitment of parents for project participation. In addition, the parenting skills instructor assisted in adapting the materials and methodologies into a curriculum. The parenting skills instructor devoted 20 hours per week to classroom instruction and 20 hours per week in planning and curriculum revision. In addition, this instructor maintained a personal journal of activities, feelings, and experiences related to instruction and training.

ESL/Literacy Instructors

The two ESL/Literacy instructors had a minimum of three years college training with background in Education; were bilingual (speaking both English and Spanish); had experience in adult education; and were familiar with second language learning strategies.

The two ESL/Literacy instructors were hired on a part-time basis (19 hours per week). One instructor taught ESL/Literacy through traditional methodologies. The other instructor taught ESL/Literacy through

cooperative learning methodologies. Both instructors were responsible for pre- and post-testing of project participants, for developing lesson plans and teaching activities; for grouping students for instruction; for keeping attendance and achievement records of the participating parents; and for improving upon the curriculum. Both instructors devoted 10 hours per week to classroom instruction and 9 hours per week in planning and training. In addition, instructors maintained personal journals of their activities, feelings, and experiences related to instruction and training.

Secretary

The project secretary had an Associates in Executive Secretarial Science; an Associates in Word Processing; and eleven years of secretarial experience.

One hundred percent of the secretary's time was dedicated to the project. The secretary was responsible for designing and implementing program forms; for typing and duplicating all training materials; for creating curriculum handouts as well as typing and duplicating curriculum; and for establishing and maintaining all project files. Specific duties included answering telephones, typing letters, memorandums, schedules, reports, purchase orders, documentation packets for training and instruction sessions, and assisting project director in financial management of project funds.

The ESL and Parenting Skills instructors were provided training on Traditional and Cooperative Learning Methodology in December, 1989. These instructors were also trained on the administration and scoring procedures for the Language Assessments Scales II in November, 1989.

Throughout the course of the first project year, the instructors were provided weekly training sessions to upgrade and fine-tune teaching skills in both Cooperative and ESL teaching methodology and included strategies and/or activities such as: Team Building, Logo, Banner, Debriefing, Team Building for Parents; Roundtable, Jigsaw for Parents, Numbered Heads Together; Paired Reading, Tea Party, Draw Around-Write Around, Total Physical Response, Modeling, Natural Approach Strategies, Language Experience Approach, and Cognitive Mapping.

The instructors were trained on the use of thematic-based rather than grammar-based curriculum and also received training in Coaching and Feedback; Feedback from the Trainer; Peer Feedback; Observation and Data Gathering; Interviewing Strategies; the use of the Concerns-based model; the use of Innovation Configurations checklists; and on interpretation of the concerns questionnaire. The trainer observed and coached the instructors throughout the training sessions.

The instructors were randomly video-taped during their instruction and coaching sessions to assess the delivery process and make the necessary adjustments.

Other project staff also received the opportunities for personal growth and development. The Project Director attended the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory meeting in Austin, Texas, which provided information, training, and technical assistance pertaining to Title VII, State Bilingual/ESL, and other federal language programs.

Both the Project Director and Parenting Skills Instructor attended the National Association For Bilingual Education Conference in Tucson, Arizona, which provided information on Family Literacy/Parental Involvement, the

impact of Bilingual Education at all educational levels, and current research data on benefits of Bilingual Education towards bilingual children.

The Project Secretary attended a local Management Skills for Secretaries Workshop, a workshop for office personnel sponsored by the El Paso Educational Secretaries Association, and local Inservice for support staff sponsored by the El Paso County Head Start Program.

D. PARENT INVOLVEMENT

A total of 118 parents from the seven Head Start centers were enrolled in the project. These parents attended classes at the four designated family literacy centers and were involved in all classroom activities. Of the 118 parents who attended classes, only 71 parents completed the course requirements and qualified to receive the stipend. Of these 71 parents, 62 expressed an interest in returning for the second project year. See First Year Participants chart below.

FIRST YEAR PARTICIPANTS

Head Start Center	Number Recruited	No. Enrolled in ESL & PS	No. Enrolled in ESL Only	No. Enrolled in PS Only	No. of Withdrawals	No. of Parents Rec. Stipend
BARCELONA	24	15	4	5	15	9
CLINT	5	5	0	0	0	5
* FABENS	20	15	5	0	10	10
* PARKDALE	7	7	0	0	0	7
SAN ELIZARIO	6	6	0	0	4	2
* SOCORRO	28	17	6	5	12	16
* TIGUA	28	21	4	3	6	22
TOTALS	**118**	86	19	13	**47**	**71**

* Designated as a Family Literacy Center

The Parenting Skills and ESL classes attended field trips to the university, local hospitals, and local banks during the first project year. Parents were provided with information on the procedures to follow when seeking assistance from each institution.

Project participants, being Head Start Parents, attended the local Head Start Parent Conference held on March 17, 1990. Several parents volunteered to assist in planning and participating in a fashion show for the entertainment of other Head Start parents attending the conference. Several hours of hard work were donated by these parents who attended fittings, selected attire at local clothing stores, and practiced walking and poise many hours with the help of a local modeling school. Local hair stylists donated their time to assist the fashion show participants with their hair styles and makeup. Project participants were excited with the opportunity to model and did an excellent job in making the fashion show a success.

Those project participants who completed the course requirements were invited to attend an award ceremony held at the Tigua Head Start Center. The parents assisted in decorating the auditorium where the ceremony was held. Parents' classroom products were used to decorate the walls and tables. During this ceremony, project participants were presented a certificate of completion for participation in the first project year.

IV. PARENT OUTCOMES

A. Objectives, Analyses, and Findings

The focus of the Family Literacy Project is on the parents, not the students. Therefore this section will summarize the outcome information on the objectives related to parents.

Objective 1 – Recruit

By December 1989, September 1990, and September 1991, identify a cadre of 20-25 parents at each of the four Head Start Centers to be participants in the three-year project.

This objective was met and exceeded by having identified and recruited 118 parents who attended ESL and/or Parenting Skills classes at the four designated Family Literacy Centers.

A total of 31 parents were identified from the Parkdale and Barcelona Head Start Sites; a total of 31 parents were identified from the Fabens, San Elizario and Clint Head Start Sites; a total of 28 parents were identified from the Socorro Head Start Site; and 28 parents were identified from the Tigua Head Start Site. See First Year Participants Chart in the Parent Involvement section for a breakdown of enrollment by site.

Objective 2 – Materials Development

By December, 1989, design curricula and materials for the Family Literacy instructional components and by August 1990 and August 1991, improve upon curricula and materials.

The curricula and materials were designed in time for parent instruction to begin in January, 1990. Due to this being the first year for the curriculum, many modifications were made during program implementation.

Objective 3 – Training and Coaching

By December, 1989, train instructors on Cooperative Learning, Sheltered Instruction, Whole Language Approaches, and Parenting Skills, and continue coaching and retraining of the instructors throughout the duration of the project.

Teachers received extensive training before the parent sessions started, and staff met regularly to review progress.

The evaluators felt, though, that there was not enough coaching and training in both the Cooperative Learning and the Traditional methods. Instructors were often left to their own device to prepare and deliver the curriculum. Consequently, the fidelity of the instruction, particularly the Cooperative Learning instruction was different than originally desired.

Objective 4 – Assessment

By May 1990, 1991 and 1992, conduct yearly pre- post-tests and 16-week session assessments to determine the impact on the parents' skills development.

Parents were tested with the LAS to determine their language dominance. All parents were determined to be Limited English Proficient. No post-test was administered to determine the gain in proficiency level.

Parents were not tested at the end of the 16-week unit to see if they had retained the content.

Interviews of parents indicated a gain from the beginning of the project. Thirty-two percent of the parents who were surveyed at the beginning of the intervention reported that they read to the children every night or at least once a week. At the end of the 16-week intervention, 93% of the parents read to their children.

Objective 5 – Parent Instruction

From January 1990 to May 1992, implement the instructional sessions for 100 parents at the four centers.

Component 1--English Literacy. Parents (105) were provided instruction in English as a Second Language. A total of 71 parents completed the course and thus received the stipend.

Component 2--Parent Training for Effective Schooling. Approximately half of the parents received this training through the Cooperative Learning method. When the evaluators observed a training session, the parents appeared to enjoy the instruction.

Component 3--Spanish Literacy. A total of 61 parents completed instruction in Spanish Literacy. The instruction included reading children's books, writing letters, reading community services pamphlets, semantic mapping activities, developing posters, and keeping personal journals. All parents were literate in their native language--Spanish.

Objective 6 – Research

From January 1990 to May 1992, conduct a research project to study the effects of the different instructional strategies and of the training model.

One test was administered during the year which can shed some light on the relative effectiveness of the Cooperative Learning model and the Traditional Model.

The Inventario de Autoestima was administered to obtain information on the self-esteem of the parents. There were three specific subscales on the instrument:

1) Attitudes toward Self,
2) Attitudes toward Academics, and
3) Attitudes in General about Education.

The instrument was a translation of the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory.

The Attitudes toward Self was comprised of such items as:

Item 4: Le caigo bien a la gente.

Item 9: Hay muchas cosas que cambiaria de mi personalidad.

(Reversed)

The Attitudes toward Academics Scale was comprised of items such as:

Item 10: Estoy orgulloso(a) de mi trabajo.

Item 5: Se me dificulta hablar en frente de mis compañeros.

(Reversed)

The Attitudes in General about Education scale was comprised of items such as:

Item 1: Me gustaria ser alguien mas.

Item 2: Me la paso soñando.

(Reversed)

The results for each of the four sites on each of the three scales are in Table 1. There are no statistically significant differences between the four means. Table 2 contains the same information, aggregated by the sites that received Cooperative Learning (Socorro and Tigua) and the sites that received the

Traditional curriculum (Fabens and Parkdale). While the Cooperative Learning sites are higher on "General Attitude" and lower on "Academic Attitude" and "Attitude Toward Self," the differences are not significant. Since this data was obtained during the intervention, one would not necessarily expect the hypothesized differences to be evident on this instrument. Perhaps the value of this data will be realized as baseline data for subsequent years.

Table 1

Means on the Three Attitude Scales by Site

Site	N	General	Academic	Self
Socorro	11	43.5	8.3	11.5
Fabens	16	39.1	8.3	12.5
Tigua	14	37.4	7.2	12.8
Parkdale	13	39.3	8.1	12.5

Note: In none of the attitude scales was there enough difference to be statistically significant.

Table 2

Means on the Three Attitude Scales by Type of Instruction

Type of Instruction	N	General	Academic	Self
Cooperative Learning	25	40.1	7.7	12.2
Traditional	29	39.2	8.2	12.5

Note: In none of the attitude scales was there enough difference to be statistically significant.

Objective 7 – Dissemination

Publish and disseminate results of the study, the training model, the teaching model and the curricula.

The Project Trainer/Researcher attended and presented at the International Conference on Cooperative Learning in Baltimore, Maryland. This conference focused on the growing popularity of Cooperative Learning and its implications. During this conference, the Trainer/Researcher discovered that Region XIX was the only agency researching Cooperative Learning for Family Literacy.

Both the Trainer/Researcher and the Parenting Skills Instructor attended the National Head Start Conference in San Antonio, Texas, and presented a workshop on Family Literacy through Cooperative Learning. This conference focused on the Head Start Program and the direction it would be taking in the next year.

B. Changes in the Withdrawal Rate

During the 16-week course, 47 parents withdrew from the project. Although most provided a reason which appeared valid, the goal of the project is to reduce the withdrawal rate in subsequent years.

For the second project year, an effort will be made to establish parent committees to assist in promoting the project, assist in project activities, and assist in the collection of materials necessary for instruction.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Objective 1 – Recruit

By December 1989, September 1990, and September 1991, identify a cadre of 20-25 parents at each of the four Head Start Centers to be participants in the three-year project.

The plan to recruit a larger number of parents, so a waiting list can be referred to when a parent withdraws will keep the number of parents being served at any one time at a constant. Of more value, perhaps is the plan to involve the parents more in the planning of the program. This lack of involvement during the first year may have led to some of the parents withdrawing.

The recommendation is to develop a waiting list and to involve parents meaningfully in planning their involvement in the program.

Objective 2 – Materials Development

By December, 1989, design curricula and materials for the Family Literacy instructional components and by August 1990 and August 1991, improve upon curricula and materials.

Although the curriculum was developed, it often was revised shortly before it was delivered to the teachers. With the one year of experience with the curriculum, staff and teachers should feel more comfortable with the curriculum and should be able to deliver it (in keeping with lesson plans made beforehand) to the parents. It is unknown to what extent the constant development affected the delivery of the curriculum in this first year of the

project. The one year's experience should lead to a smoother delivery in the second year.

Recommendation is made to continue reviewing the curriculum so that it addresses parent needs and program objectives.

Objective 3 – Training and Coaching

By December, 1989, train instructors on Cooperative Learning, Sheltered Instruction, Whole Language Approaches, and Parenting Skills, and continue coaching and retraining of the instructors throughout the duration of the project.

Teachers were not as comfortable with their methodologies as they could have been, partly because their training was not as comprehensive nor as continuous as it could have been. The extent to which these weaknesses detracted from the parent's sessions is unknown.

It is recommended that teachers be given thorough training in their assigned methodologies, and that monitoring be conducted on an unannounced, but fairly frequent basis. Teachers should also be given the opportunity to seek help, both from project staff and from other resources.

Objective 4 – Assessment

By May 1990, 1991 and 1992, conduct yearly pre- post-tests and 16-week session assessments to determine the impact on the parents' skills development.

The major activity that was not implemented was the assessment. The evaluation plan called for pre- and post-testing of 1) Oral language proficiency, 2) Informal Reading Inventory, and 3) Literacy practices,

Additionally, sociograms and innovative uses were to be obtained throughout the year. Although the LAS was obtained at pre-test, information on the Literacy practices, literacy attitudes, and educational aspirations was obtained during the second half of the project.

The absence of data did not affect program delivery. Since no gains could be calculated, no program effects could be attributed to the project or components of the project.

It is recommended that the project staff obtain all the pre-test and post-test data during year two.

Objective 5 – Parent Instruction

From January 1990 to May 1992, implement the instructional sessions for 100 parents at the four centers.

Parents liked the ESL and Health classes.

It is recommended that these classes continue, as they are the focal point of this project. But project staff need to be aware that some 62 parents indicated that they would be involved during the second year. This means that different content needs to be included. Interviews and observations detected that many parents were giving their children "the answers." Next year's curriculum needs to model how to guide children to think and learn to find their own answers.

Objective 6 – Research

From January 1990 to May 1992, conduct a research project to study the effects of the different instructional strategies and of the training model.

Since pre-test and post-test data were not obtained, comparison of Cooperative Learning and the Traditional method was not possible. As discussed above, the collection of said data will allow for comparisons. Collection of comparable data in other Head Start sites was not possible nor applicable for this task. All efforts will be made to test and collect the necessary data for the second year implementation.

Objective 7 – Dissemination

Publish and disseminate results of the study, the training model, the teaching model and the curricula.

Dissemination of the first year efforts was accomplished through presentations at the National Head Start Conference in March, 1990, and at the International Conference on Cooperative Learning in Baltimore, Maryland in July, 1990.

FAMILY LITERACY FOR PARENTS OF PRE-SCHOOLERS
INVENTARIO DE AUTOESTIMA

Nombre _____ Plantel de Headstart _____
Fecha _____ ___Parenting ___ESL
Maestro _____ ___Male ___Female

	Sí	No estoy seguro	No
1. Me gustaría ser alguien más.	( )	( )	( )
2. Me la paso soñando.	( )	( )	( )
3. Estoy muy seguro(a) de mi . mismo(a).	( )	( )	( )
4. Le caigo bien a la gente.	( )	( )	( )
5. Se me dificulta hablar en frente de mis compañeros.	( )	( )	( )
6. Me gustaría estar más joven.	( )	( )	( )
7. Yo tomo decisiones sin mucha dificultad.	( )	( )	( )
8. Siempre me divierto.	( )	( )	( )
9. Hay muchas cosas que cambiaría de mi personalidad.	( )	( )	( )

Appendix B

	Si	No estoy seguro	No
10. Estoy orgulloso(a) de mi trabajo.	( )	( )	( )
11. Me es muy difícil acostumbrarme a situaciones nuevas.	( )	( )	( )
12. Siempre me tienen que indicar que hacer.	( )	( )	( )
13. Muy seguido me arrepiento de lo que hago.	( )	( )	( )
14. Mis amistades me aprecian mucho.	( )	( )	( )
15. Yo siempre hago mi trabajo lo mejor posible.	( )	( )	( )
16. Me doy por vencido(a) facilmente.	( )	( )	( )
17. Cuido bien de mi persona.	( )	( )	( )
18. Soy bastante felíz.	( )	( )	( )

	Sí	No estoy seguro	No
19. Prefiero juntarme con gente mas joven que yo.	( )	( )	( )
20. Me gusta que me hagan preguntas en las clases.	( )	( )	( )
21. Me conozco bien a mi mismo (a).	( )	( )	( )
22. Me es difícil ser yo.	( )	( )	( )
23. Mi vida es una confusión.	( )	( )	( )
24. No hago mi trabajo tan bien como debería hacerlo.	( )	( )	( )
25. Mis amigos hacen lo que que yo les sugiero.	( )	( )	( )
26. Tomo decisiones firmes.	( )	( )	( )
27. Me gusta ser mujer/hombre.	( )	( )	( )

	Sí	No estoy seguro	No
28. Tengo muy mala opinion de mi mismo.	( )	( )	( )
29. Me gusta estar con la gente.	( )	( )	( )
30. A menudo me enojo en el trabajo.	( )	( )	( )
31. Seguido me avergüenzo de mi mismo.	( )	( )	( )
32. No soy tan bien parecido como la mayor parte de la gente.	( )	( )	( )
33. Cuando quiero decir algo, yo lo digo.	( )	( )	( )
34. Mis amigas(os) se burlan de mi con frecuencia.	( )	( )	( )
35. Mi jefe me hace sentir que no sirvo para nada.	( )	( )	( )
36. No me importa lo que pase conmigo.	( )	( )	( )

	Sí	No estoy seguro	No
37. Soy un(a) fracasado(a).	( )	( )	( )
38. Me da coraje cuando me regañan.	( )	( )	( ).
39. A mi casi nadie me quiere.	( )	( )	( )
40. Me desanimo muy seguido en el trabajo.	( )	( )	( )
41. Casi nada me preocupa.	( )	( )	( )
42. Nadie puede depender en mi.	( )	( )	( )

THE SOURCE OF APPENDIX B:

COOPERSMITH. SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY. TRANSLATED BY MARGARITA CALDERON